Nine Years After The Bay of Pigs, P. 2

Déja Vu Dept.

Tell Washington we could use 200,000 American troops and after two years we could handle the situation by ourselves like the South Vietnamese.—*Commander of a Cambodian battalion to the* Washington Post's *Laurence Stern April 22.*

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL. XVIII, NO. 9 MAY 4, 1970 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

How Earth Day Was Polluted

The week the devoted band of youngsters who ran the Vietnam Moratorium gave up in despair was the week in which other youngsters all over the country, with the full support of the Establishment and its press, celebrated Earth Day. On the grassy slopes of the Sylvan Theatre in the shadow of the Washington Monument, where so many anti-war teach-ins have been held, a predominantly youthful audience jumped with joy as the rock bands played. Looking out at that tumultuous sea of sweet faces, in their long hair and bizarre costumes, I felt that just as the Caesars once used bread and circuses so ours were at last learning to use rock-and-roll, idealism and non-inflammatory social issues to turn the youth off from more urgent concerns which might really threaten the power structure. And I said so in my speech.

Already Rifles For Cambodia

The pollution issue is real enough, though a little exaggerated, but it cannot be solved in isolation. From one viewpoint, the Earth Day affair was a gigantic snow job. Here was the country slipping into a wider war in Southeast Asia. Even as we spoke the news was leaking that U.S. officers in civilian clothes, either CIA or military, were directing a South Vietnamese offensive into Cambodia and that six days earlier the U.S. had already promised the new Cambodian regime a few thousand rifles but had asked them (*NYT* 4/23/70) to keep the shipment secret. Two days before the Earth Day rally, Secretary of Defense Laird had made a speech to the Associated Press which can only be read as a deliberate effort to sabotage the SALT talks, but here we were talking as if we had nothing to worry about but our drains.

The anti-pollution campaign was saved providentially from a Nixon message but half the Cabinet were on the day's soap-boxes. The only bright note was provided by the oldest section of the American revolutionary movement, the DAR. Their convention denounced anti-pollution as a subversive movement. The clear proof: It was being entertained by Pete Seeger "a documented Communist." "It's strange, isn't it," one DAR speaker noted astutely (ah, if only the CIA and the FBI were as sharp as these old dowagers!), "that today is Lenin Day and Earth Day." If it was anybody else in the White House but Richard Nixon they'd have been calling him Vladimir Ilyitch.

The Nixon budget should clear him of suspicion. He called air and water pollution a "now or never" task but turned in a budget which allocates 52 cents of every general revenue dollar to the military and space, but only four-tenths of one cent per dollar to air and water pollution. New weaponry alone gets $5.4 billion while air and water pollution get $569 million. Senator Tydings at the University of Maryland Earth Day said we ought to be spending on pollution what we are spending on the Vietnam war. But nobody knows what that is. Laird said months ago it would be $17 billion but this year for the first time in history part of the military budget is blacked out, and no figures are given for certain items, Vietnam among them.

Another Heroic Stand At Credibility Gulch

We finally have in sight the just peace we are seeking . . . pacification is succeeding. We can say with confidence that the South Vietnamese can develop the capability for their own defense. . . . The enemy has failed to win the war. . . .

—*President Nixon from San Clemente April 20.*

The [Nixon] announcement also surprised some Pentagon officers who told the AP South Vietnamese troops have yet to face a major battlefield test. . . . "The moment of truth is approaching," AP military writer Fred Hoffman quoted one General as saying. "Some of their divisions are not the greatest." . . . Asked if there would be any withdrawals in the next two months, a Pentagon spokesman declined to say.

—Washington Post *April 22.*

Perhaps more typical of informed South Vietnamese opinion [than official optimism] were the comments today of Nguyen Van An, chairman of the defense committee of the lower house. An said it would be wiser not to raise the question of the South Vietnamese army's ability to take over from the Americans. He added it would be better if the Americans stayed.

—*Same paper same day from Saigon.*

Unless there is a sharp change of course we are already in the first stages of a wider and more costly Second Indochinese War. Our secret services brought it on, upsetting the status quo in Cambodia by encouraging the anti-Sihanouk coup, as they upset the Laotian status quo with their Plain of Jars offensive last year. The enemy took up the challenge, and now Nixon's latest Vietnam message has raised the stakes by putting Cambodia and Laos squarely into the area of our concern. We must either get out altogether or plunge in further, for the military consequences otherwise would leave South Vietnam outflanked. You can kiss good-bye to any hope of controlling inflation if Nixon takes the plunge.

What a time to talk about pollution! What a time to fill the campuses, the press, the radio and TV with Earth Day talk when such momentous secret decisions are being made. Education on the complex tasks of air and water control are all to the good, and should be sharpened to a fundamental discussion of governmental and corporate policy the Establishment doesn't want. But how much more urgent and important to educate the public while there is still time to the more critical issues of the widening war in Southeast Asia and the SALT talks in Vienna. On both Nixon is waging a con game, and Earth Day distracted from it. In the former he remains a

(Continued on Page Four)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SENATOR KENNEDY CHOSE THE 9TH ANNIVERSARY of the Bay of Pigs April 17 and the annual Mansfield lecture at the University of Montana, to add up the sombre score on the failure of the Alliance for Progress. The rate of economic growth since it was launched has averaged 1.8% per capita, less than before; U.S. economic assistance has averaged less than half what was promised; in the last 8 years U.S. business has repatriated $8.3 billion in private profits, more than three times the total of new investments; the land remains in the hands of a few; one-third the rural labor force is unemployed, and 13 constitutional governments have been overthrown since the Alliance was launched. The same political oppression and torture for which the Council of Europe has expelled the Greek junta are rife in Latin America but the Organization of American States is silent. Kennedy proposed that we abolish all our military missions as hotbeds of dictatorship and end sale of arms on credit. It is a pleasure to add that a member of the family which ostracized Castro Cuba and tried to strangle it by economic blockade also called for the first steps to end that blockade and to readmit Cuba to the hemisphere family.

Truman Veto Finally Upheld

A BELATED 85TH BIRTHDAY PRESENT FOR PRESIDENT TRUMAN: Twenty years after Congress overrode Truman's veto of the Internal Security Act which set up the Subversive Activities Control Board, the Supreme Court has thrown the Board on the political junk heap by refusing to hear the Justice Department appeal in the Boorda case. Some years ago the Court ruled that the Board could not force Communists to register because that would be a violation of the Fifth Amendment. Thereupon Dirksen put through an amendment authorizing the Board to run a blacklist of suspected Communists without requiring them to register. The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia held unanimously in an opinion by Chief Judge Bazelon that this was a violation of the First amendment. "The effect of the decision," the Justice Department pleaded in asking the Supreme Court to reverse, "would be the substantial destruction of the statutory disclosure scheme and the frustration of the SACB's reason for existence." The refusal to review leaves the Board's five $35,000-a-year members with no real powers or duties. Successive decisions have outlawed the travel, registration, defense facilities employment and blacklist provisions of this witch hunt statute, designed to set up America's first thought control agency. A respectful tip of the hat to Attorneys John Abt and Joseph Forer who won this and many of the earlier cases against great odds in a hostile atmosphere as counsel for Communists, real or alleged, who were being hounded under the statute.

Required Reading For Nixon and Mitchell

House Republicans insist their talk of impeaching Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas in no way stems from the Senate's rejection of two Presidential nominees to the Court. Anyone who accepts that at face value probably also can believe that politics had nothing to do with the Senate votes on Clement F. Haynsworth Jr. and G. Harrold Carswell. . . .

In the case of Justice Douglas the House Republicans emphasize his involvement with the Parvin Foundation, which had ties to Las Vegas gambling enterprises, and some of his published statements that appear to condone revolutionary behavior by dissenters. It is difficult not to conclude, however, that their major objection has something to do with the fact that the Justice is perhaps the Court's farthest-out liberal.

What the House Republicans propose to try, with little hope of success, could only continue the deterioration of the Court's prestige, something the nation can ill afford. If the GOP lawmakers would serve the Court and their country, they can do it by abandoning this foolishness now.

—Wall St. Journal *editorial April 4.*

IN A HALF-PAGE ADVERTISEMENT in the London *Times* April 17, 68 clergymen, representing every religious group in Great Britain, and including three Lord Bishops of the Church of England, appealed to the government to reverse its stand of last Feb. 2 exempting tear gases from the Geneva Protocal. They pointed out that every British government for over 40 years had held to the contrary, as did the UN General Assembly by 80 votes to 3 (with 36 abstentions) last December 16. Some day we may know what price or pressure enabled Nixon to win Harold Wilson's approval for this U.S. position.

NEW LOW IN REPUBLICAN JURISPRUDENCE: House Republican leader Gerald Ford's contention in his attacks on Mr. Justice Douglas that an impeachable offense is anything a majority of the House says it is. Rep. McCloskey (*R. Cal.*) in a House speech April 21 attacking Ford said this doctrine

How Nixon's ABM Proposals Undercut SALT And Entail A More Intense Arms Race

I have demonstrated that Safeguard is ineffective in defending Minuteman, and is incapable of providing a tight umbrella over the U.S. to defend reliably against ICBM attacks which Mainland China might be able to launch late this decade. Despite the clear technical limitations of Safeguard as an anti-Chinese defense the very fact that the President has stated such a defense to be a U.S. policy objective creates a danger to the success of SALT. Once the Congress approves an expanded Safeguard, the Soviets will find it impossible to agree to ABM levels of their own below those proposed by the U.S.

Current Soviet ABM deployment levels consist of only the few interceptors and associated radars deployed around Moscow. The *expanded* Safeguard system now before the Congress involves more interceptor missiles than those deployed around Moscow and is technically much more advanced. An ABM freeze agreed at SALT at a level no lower than that of the expanded Safeguard system would thus permit and in fact encourage the Soviets to further expand and improve their ABM.

If the agreed ABM levels are high then both sides will insist on higher levels of offensive arms in order to retain their deterrent. *Thus the level of ABM defenses ultimately will control the limit which one has any hope of imposing on offensive and defensive strategic weapons.* [Italics in original].

The level of ABM deployment is even more critical than the question of prohibition of MIRV testing and deployment and the associated questions of verification. A highly accurate MIRV can only threaten the fixed land-based deterrent of the other side; for example the multiple nuclear warheads of the SS-9's may endanger our Minutemen, and Soviet fears that upgrading and accuracy of the U.S. Poseidon and Minuteman III MIRV's may endanger the Soviet land-based missile silos are well justified. In contrast, ABM's threaten to intercept ballistic missiles from wherever they are launched—land or sea.

In short, the world is embarking on the next large step of the arms race. Yet the world has now strategic nuclear armament sufficient to destroy life as we know it on both the European and North American continents.

—W. K. H. Panofsky, a scientific adviser to the military since 1955, before Senate Foreign Relations April 13. (abr.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would undermine the independence of the judiciary and subject the court to political press . . . SHEIKH JAABARI, MAYOR OF HEBRON, suggested in an interview with the London Times April 15 that the West Bank and other occupied areas be put under UN trusteeship for five years while a final settlement is negotiated. He said that if Jews were to settle in Hebron, Arabs should be allowed to settle in Jaffa, Haifa and Beersheeba . . . GEN. WESTMORELAND'S PRIZE REMARK to the DAR meeting here April 20, "Our own revolution has ended the need for revolution forever."

Aviation Journal Opposes ABM

AN EDITORIAL IN SPACE/AERONAUTICS for March says "it would cost the Chinese very little time and effort to raise their ICBM forces a notch or two, in either numbers or design, to a level at which it could saturate any area defense the U.S. might put up." It asks why we need area defense "against a weak Chinese threat, seeing that we got along without one when the Soviets had no more ICBMs than China will have a few years from now?" It concludes that "as much as anything else, it has been a succession of technically and strategically feeble argument for new weapon systems that has led to a crisis of confidence in the leadership of America's defense."

SENATOR RIBICOFF has fired the opening gun in the battle to upgrade Nixon's niggardly family assistance act as passed by the House. "The $30 a month allowable income," Rep. Stokes (D. Ohio) told the House before passage, "is barely enough to cover the cost of going to and from the job . . . There is no provision for cost of living increases. And perhaps most pernicious of all, the whole scheme seems still to be premised on the attitude that the recipient is basically a lazy, booze-guzzling ne'er do well—an attitude proved totally fallacious long ago to those who cared to listen." The bill's only virtue is that it establishes the minimum income in U.S. law. Now it must be raised to livable levels.

THE LATEST REPORT BY AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL discusses the practice in the Soviet Union of treating political dissenters as insane, putting them in cells with disturbed patients and allowing orderlies recruited from the security police to administer "shock" treatment for purposes of interrogation. The report says there are six "special" psychiatric hospitals for this purpose and that political prisoners are "the victims of daily beatings and sadistic humiliations."

PRESIDENTIAL ADVISER HENRY KISSINGER walked out of an off the record discussion with students of the Johns Hopkins School of International Studies after a student read a statement blaming him for his role in the Vietnam war and a student asked, "Do you consider yourself a war criminal?" (*Washington Star,* April 18.) . . . JUDGE CARSWELL WOULD HAVE TO BE an out and out Fascist to be worse than Rep. Cramer (R. Fla) Nixon's original choice for the Republican Senate nomination in Florida. Cramer was the author of those anti-riot provisions of the 1968 Civil Rights Act under which the Chicago 7 were convicted. The American Conservative Union gives Cramer a cumulative rating of 88 while the ADA has rated him 0 in seven of the last 10 years . . . IN AN EXCLUSIVE April 20, Louis Heren, chief Washington correspondent of the London *Times,* says the Pentagon will withdraw 25,000 troops from Europe in the next 12 months, despite official assurances to the contrary. The latest House defense budget hearings (Pt. 2) show the total cost of maintaining 300,000 U.S. soldiers and sailors in Europe is $14 billion a year . . .

OUR FAVORITE REMARK OF THE WEEK: "I don't think we should go on doing things blindly, just because we are told to."—Mrs. Winifred D. Cockfield, wife of the skipper of the nuclear sub Nautilus and daughter of a retired Admiral, when asked at the court martial of Roger Priest for sedition why she distributed copies of his anti-war paper *OM* at an Army commissary. Mrs. Cockfield, though a prosecution witness, said she thought the Vietnam war "a terrible mistake."

The Personal Views of a Leading Banker

If a company in private business were guilty of making such a bad judgment as we have made in Vietnam, and then of pursuing that judgment until so large a part of its total resources were committed to the ill-starred project, the management would be under attack by the directors and shareholders. . . . Because I have no reason to doubt the good faith of the withdrawal plans announced by the President, I might have continued to remain silent. But when I read 12 days ago that the President is under pressure to expand our military role in Asia, it seemed to me that the time had come to speak up and speak out. . . . Our enlightened self-interest dictates that we help other countries in their economic development. . . . But it does not dictate . . . that we set ourselves up as the self-appointed and solo policeman of the entire world.

—L. B. Lundborg, Bank of America, to Senate Foreign Relations, April 15. See box below.

The Chairman of The Country's Biggest Bank on The Economic Impact of The Vietnam War

Despite the protestations of the New Left, the fact is that an end to the war would be good, not bad, for American business. In the middle of 1964 when the Vietnam escalation began, the economy was in quite good shape. We had at that time an uninterrupted economic advance of 52 months—a peacetime record—unemployment averaged 4½ percent, the consumer price index had increased only 1.2 percent during the first 6 months of 1965, and the average operating rate of industrial capacity was at 90 percent.

The Vietnam war has not been good for business profits. During the four years prior to the escalation of the conflict in Vietnam, corporate profits after taxes rose 71.0 percent. From 1966 through 1969 corporate profits after taxes rose only 9.2 percent.

It is important to comment briefly on what has happened to the U.S. balance of payments. The best measure of what happened to the long run position is the balance on current account. This balance declined from a surplus of $7.8 billion in 1964 to about $4 billion in 1967 and $1.4 billion in 1968 and less than $1 billion in 1969. A good part of the progressive deterioration of this position over the years since 1964, the year before the major acceleration of the Vietnam war, may be accounted for by the large increase in foreign exchange outflows associated with military expenditures. These rose from less than $3 billion in 1964 to nearly $5 billion in 1969.

In the five-year period prior to the Vietnam escalation, defense spending in the United States averaged $50 billion per year. If we assume that this level would have been maintained over the most recent five-year period in the absence of escalation, the increase in actual spending totaled $118 billion. During the past four years, total spending for residential construction in the United States totaled only $112 billion. When we survey the very real needs in our economy in the areas of housing, urban transit, environmental pollution, etc., it is clearly evident that we do not need to create war-related demand for resources in order to maintain full employment.

—Louis B. Lundborg, Chairman of the Board, Bank of America, before Senate Foreign Relations April 15 (abr.).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Laird Is Washington's Biggest Liar Since John Foster Dulles

(Continued from Page One)

prisoner of the terrible power of inertia. He still wants to avoid humiliation. How to avoid some humiliation for so many disastrous mistakes? He still wants victory of some sort: indeed he speaks as if it were possible and imminent. And what is the meaning of the message leaked through James Reston (*NYT* 4/22/70) that he will use "any" weapon to prevent a major military defeat as and when more troops are withdrawn? Are we back in desperation to the lunatic nonsense of threatening to use nuclear weapons?

Toward A First Strike

The campuses and the communications media should be full of these questions, as they should be full of discussion about SALT. There the battle to curb the arms race is being lost even as it begins. The day the SALT talks opened, Nixon had leading Senators in for a snow job. What Nixon is really trying to pull off was indicated four days earlier when Nixon won the support of Mendel Rivers and House Armed Services for a $1.4 billion expansion of the ABM in return for $300 million more for the Navy. The ABM expansion was cleared publicly the day the SALT talks reopened. Seen from the other side this signals a U.S. drive for an area defense and an area defense is a necessity for a first strike strategy. The night before the SALT talks opened, Secretary Rogers chose the significant vehicle of an interview with Radio Free Berlin to declare again our intention to go ahead with MIRV. Add MIRV to ABM and there is nothing for SALT to do but ratify a new spiral in the arms race. That has been Nixon's intention from the beginning.

Senator Jackson, whom Nixon wanted as Secretary of Defense, is working hard on the Hill, and Laird, whom Nixon took as second choice, is working hard out of the Pentagon to make sure that SALT does not succeed. The Laird speech to the AP April 20 is the most mendacious performance by a U.S. official since the days of John Foster Dulles. The Soviets are several years behind us in nuclear proficiency. They have just begun to deploy a solid fuel equivalent of Minuteman. They have just begun to develop MRV. We had it several years ago and are already developing MIRV. The latest report of the London Institute of Strategic Studies released April 11 showed that thanks to MIRV our present total of 4200 deliverable warheads (as against the Soviet's just under 1,900) would become 11,000 by 1975—a stupendous imbalance, clearly raising the threat of a first strike. Yet Laird told the AP editors we had been standing still for five years while the Russians have been forging ahead!

Laird achieved this bit of trickery by ignoring the enormous qualitative advances we have made in those five years and focusing on the Soviet's effort to make up in numbers and in megatonnage (which is wasteful) for their lag in accuracy, multiple independently targeted warheads *and* numbers. He continued to impute to the Russians a desire to achieve what our Air Force has long sought—first strike capacity. If the roles were reversed and a Soviet official were to present so false and inflammatory a picture of the power balance we would decide that it was time to pack our bags and head for home. Let pollution buffs notice Dr. Panofsky's testimony (box p. 2) that we already have enough weapons between us to make the entire Northern Hemisphere unlivable in one swift nuclear exchange. If SALT fails and we up the firepower, we may wake up one morning and find there is nothing left of Earth to pollute. *April 23.*

On Lenin's 100th: Without Varnish

A few years ago, during the "thaw" in the Soviet Union, the rebels called the conservative writers the "varnishers"—those who varnished reality to suit the party line. On the 100th anniversary of the birth of Lenin, the unvarnished truth about the State he established is that nowhere in the world is there a more stuffy society, led by more timid conservatives. Nowhere—not even in Franco Spain—is there less freedom of expression. The best writers are in labor camps or cowed. A half century ago in America, in the Western Pennsylvania coal and steel towns, there was a bitter struggle against company towns, company police, company unions. The Soviet Union today is like a huge company town with company unions and a company press. To put it in terms of the dialectic, the liberation of 1917 has become a new enslavement, and waits the cleansing broom of a new revolution, in which men again can speak their minds.

The 1969 Index Is Now Ready—You Can Have A Copy Free By Sending A LONG Self-Addressed Stamped Envelope For It—Why Not Save The Index and Past Issues For Ready Reference In A Spring Binder?

And Send a Gift Sub With Your Request for The Index?

FOR STONE'S HIDDEN HISTORY

For the enclosed $7.50 send I. F. Stone's book, **The Hidden History of The Korean War** (Monthly Review Press.)

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... **Zip**..... **State**.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... **Zip**..... **State**.....

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly 5/4/70

4420 29th St. N. W., Washington, D. C. 20008

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

4420 29th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20008

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly. 2d Class Postage Paid at Washington, D.C. Published every other Monday except in August at 4420 29th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. An independent bi-weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Isrnel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED